R842-09 ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 230 1-31-67 08 (REV)

A PROPOSAL FOR THE PLANNING OF ONE-WEEK WORKSHOPS IN EVALUATION RESEARCH FOR STATE AND CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL.

SEASHORE, CHARLES N.
MZI43848 NATIONAL TRAINING LABS., WASHINGTON, D.C.

BR-5-0699
17-OCT-66 OEC-6-85-009
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.12 28P.

*PLANNING, PROGRAM PLANNING, RESOURCE MATERIALS, HUMAN RESOURCES, TRAINING, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *STATE AID, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, LEGISLATION, *EVALUATION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, WORKSHOPS, *MEETINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUBLIC LAW 89-10

THIS REPORT DESCRIBES THE PROCESS OF PLANNING NINE REGIONAL MEETINGS FOR PROVIDING EVALUATION RESEARCH TRAINING. GOALS OF THE PLANNING PROCESS WERE (1) TO FORMULATE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR THE REGIONAL MEETINGS, (2) TO DEVELOP A TRAINING DESIGN FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THESE MEETINGS, (3) TO ASSESS AVAILABLE STAFF RESOURCES FOR THESE MEETINGS, AND (4) TO OUTLINE THE KINDS OF RESOURCE MATERIALS NEEDED FOR THE MEETINGS. THE REPORT PRESENTS A LISTING OF THE PLANNING GROUP MEMBERS, PLANNING ISSUES, MAJOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES, THE SELECTED MEETING DATES AND SITES, AND THREE MODEL DESIGNS DEVELOPED FOR THE MEETINGS. THE REGIONAL MEETINGS WERE SUBSEQUENTLY HELD UNDER CONTRACT OE-6-10-209 (ED 010 229), INVOLVING STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL WHO WERE TRAINED IN PROPOSAL EVALUATION RESEARCH (AS APPLIED TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10). (JH)

ED010230

5069

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OE-6-85-009

A PROPOSAL FOR THE PLANNING OF ONE-WEEK WORKSHOPS IN EVALUATION RESEARCH FOR STATE AND CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL, FINAL REPORT

Dr. Charles N. Seashore
Program Director

October 17, 1966

National Training Laboratories
Division of
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

I. BACKGROUND

The Office of Education requested the submission of this project as a proposal following the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 of P.L. 89-10 in order to provide for the possibility of regional workshops in evaluation research for state department of education personnel. This was a particular concern due to the inclusion in Title I of a stipulation requiring objective assessment of all projects conducted under that Title. The project reported here was for the planning process, which culminated in the submission of a proposal and subsequent funding by the Office of Education for the actual carrying out of these nine regional meetings. (Contract #OE-6-10-209)

II. GOALS

1. To formulate specific goals for the nine regional meetings.

2. To develop plans and training design for conducting nine regional meetings for state department of education personnel.

3. To assess staff resources in vocational education, the Office of Education, the American Educational Research Association, and other behavioral science research and training organizations which could be made available for the meetings.

4. To outline the kinds of resource materials needed for participants in the regional meetings.

III. THE PLANNING GROUP

The design for the planning process included two 2-day meetings in August, 1965, which were separated enough in time to allow for interim work by the nine-person planning group. The members of this planning group were as follows:

Dr. William Asher
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
(now at School of Education, University of Pittsburgh)

Dr. Robert Beynon
Research Director
Ohio State Department of Education

Dr. Robert Chin
Human Relations Center
Boston University

Dr. Richard Dershimer
Executive Secretary, American Educational Research Association
National Education Association

Dr. Nicholas Georgiady
Deputy Superintendent
Michigan State Dept. of Education.

Dr. Michael Giammatteo
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Ray Jongeward
Acting Deputy Director
Division of Adult and Vocational Educ.
U.S. Office of Education
(now at Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington)

Dr. Helen Nelson
Home Economics Department
Cornell University

Dr. Charles Seashore
Research Director
National Training Laboratories
National Education Association

IV. ISSUES IN PLANNING

The following issues were identified as major decision points in the design of the regional meetings:

1. Length of meeting: three-day or one-week.
2. Assessment of level of research sophistication of participants.
3. Identification of the particular needs of participants in their various state department of education functions.
4. The degree of integration of program with the Office of Education Guidelines.
5. The necessary material needed for support of the project.
6. The timing and location of the programs.
7. The selection of the specific objectives to be met through the regional meetings.

V. MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

1. A search was made for source materials on evaluation study procedures. These materials formed the basis for a major document which was produced under the grant for the conduct of the meetings and was delivered to the Office of Education March, 1966. The Table of Contents for this set of materials is included below:

A Guide to
Evaluation of Title I
of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Evaluation: Responsibilities and Questions
Perspective
What is Evaluation? -- An Overview
Why Describe Objectives Clearly?
How to Clarify Objectives
Criterion Tests
Measuring Student Change
Achievement Tests
Guidelines for Testing Disadvantaged Children
- List of Standardized Tests
- Publishers of Tests
- Glossary of Terms

Developing a Testing Program
Measuring Steps Along the Path
Developing an Evaluation Plan
Preparation of Summary Evaluation Report
APPENDIX
- References
- Bibliography

2. A flow chart was developed of the probable sequence of activities in the development of a state department of education plan for the utilization of Title I funds.

3. A wide variety of objectives were examined as possible central concerns of the regional meetings. Out of this list the following seven were selected as the major points for emphasis:

   a. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.

   b. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.

   c. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.

   d. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.

   e. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.

   f. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.

   g. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.

4. Lists were prepared for potential resources for staffing the meetings. This was done through the use of the National Training Laboratories network of behavioral scientists, the American Educational Research Association office, and the identification of state department of education personnel who were particularly skilled in evaluation research. The list of all staff members is included in the Appendix to this report which summarizes the results of these meetings.

5. Sample studies were screened to identify the major kinds of projects which would be funded under Title I. These projects fell into four major categories which were used by the staff in planning their specific meetings. The four areas are as follows:

   a. Curriculum innovation, including new media.

   b. The addition of personnel to reduce teacher-pupil ratio.

   c. Enlargement or addition of facilities.

   d. Enrichment programs such as special courses in reading, mathematics, etc.

VI. SELECTION OF DATES AND SITES FOR MEETINGS

It was decided that in order to make the programs available early enough in the fall so that state department of education people could be of maximum use to local education associations, that the programs would be three days in length, conducted in the month of October, 1965. The sites chosen were the Regional Headquarters of the Office of Education. Five Eastern meetings were held October 17-20, 1965, at Boston, New York, Atlanta Charlottesville, and Chicago. Four Western meetings were held October 24-27, 1965, at Kansas City, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco. Each program was designed for approximately 40 participants with four staff representing a balance of training, research, and state department of education resources. A National Training Laboratories member was chosen as the chairman of each staff group. Provision was written into the design for a pre-meeting for the chairmen of the nine regional meetings and a one-day meeting of each staff group prior to their meeting. In addition, data was collected at the end of the first meetings for modification of the design in the second meetings.

VII. DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL DESIGNS

Three model designs were developed for the program with provision made for staff to select those particular units in any design that would be most helpful for the participants in that particular meeting. These three designs appear on pages 2 - 8 of the Appendix.

APPENDIX

REGIONAL MEETINGS IN EVALUATION RESEARCH

Contract No. OE-6-10-209

Dr. Charles N. Seashore
Program Director

October 17-20, 1966 and October 24-27, 1966

The training program reported herein was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment of the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

National Training Laboratories
Division of
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

This project provided for nine regional meetings for state department of education personnel who were associated with evaluation research sections of proposals from local school districts for funds under P.L. 89-10. These meetings were staffed by four-man teams of consultants in training design, educational research, and state department of education administration. They were designed to meet the following objectives:

1. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.

2. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.

3. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.

4. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.

5. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.

6. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.

7. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.

II. PROCEDURES

The urgency of this program in helping state department of education personnel give assistance to local school districts meant that the programs should be held as early in the fall as possible. The five Eastern Region meetings were held in Boston, New York, Charlottesville, Atlanta, and Chicago from October 17 through October 20, 1965, beginning with a Sunday evening meeting and going through Wednesday afternoon. The four Western Region meetings were held in Kansas City, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco from October 20 through October 24, 1965, with a similar time schedule. A roster of the staff and participants who attended each of these programs is included in Appendix A.

Participants were invited following an invitation from the U.S. Office of Education to the state departments of education which was asked to nominate four to six persons to attend the program. In some cases, local school district personnel were included as well as state department of education representatives.

III. DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM

The task of designing the programs was divided between a planning group representing the U.S. Office of Education, National Training Laboratories, State Departments of Education, and educational researchers. These preliminary plans were then developed in further detail by the chairmen of each of the nine programs which met prior to the first meetings. Further designing was done by the staff group of four which met one day prior to the meeting.

Emphasis was placed on the utilization of the experiences, problems, materials, and plans of the participant group so that the format of each meeting was flexible enough to be modified as appropriate. However, three alternative designs were developed for each staff to draw upon, and these designs represent the kinds of sessions that were included in the various meetings. Although no two meetings were exactly alike, most of them drew heavily upon Design I with some modifications using techniques outlined in Designs II and III.

A. Design I

Monday A.M. Objective: To move from statement of problem to analysis of forces operating within problem on evaluation.

9:15 Force-field analysis of change forces and restraining forces in evaluation:
within state
within self
state laws
administrative structure

11:00 What issues and forces will our state department have to deal with? (State groups meet separately. No staff present but available to be called into group for consultation).

Monday P.M. Objective: To clarify various levels, purposes and formats of evaluation, up to and including evaluation research and research.

Structure: Large meeting with buzz groups.

Procedure: Present lecturette on concept of levels of evaluation, format, etc. Provide example of research that exemplified the concept, with brief buzz session following.

Do the same for each concept, level of evaluation, research format.

Monday Evening. Objective: To practice and apply concepts of levels of evaluation to a concrete case in cross-state groups. To clarify the acceptable as well as most ideal levels of evaluation research. To give examples of the acceptable as well as most ideal levels of evaluation research.

(Staff meeting in evening after last session. Possibility of one member of each state meeting with staff to review events of the day and to give the staff feedback for future planning).

Tuesday A.M. Objective: To continue the application and analysis of research concepts in concrete situations of differing complexity.

Structure: Four work groups, A, B, C, D, with staff leader. 1½ hours. Each group is given a concrete study, analyze the study in terms of research concepts, evaluation, etc.

The same procedure with a more complex case.

Tuesday P.M.

Each group design a study based upon a common problem presented to the group by the staff. (1½ hours)

Total group comes together and each group presents the study they have designed for total group analysis.

Staff can feed in additional concepts and elaboration of previous concepts where appropriate. (1½ hours)

Tuesday Evening

State groups meet separately, prepare guidelines (time plan), discuss deficiencies and resources in the state, discuss degree of initiative the state desires to take in program.

Wednesday A.M.

Each group reports to total group the previous night's discussion and conclusions.

Total group discusses future programming, aspirations, lifting of sights.

Total group discusses how to achieve goals, disseminate information to local districts, use consultants, communicate with each other.

Small state groups meet to discuss re-model of plan, goals, changed attitudes, etc.

Wednesday P.M.

Report of state group
Discussion of broad goals of education
Evaluation of workshop

B. Design II

Monday A.M. and P.M.

Purpose: To increase awareness of various levels of research design sophistication.

Structure: Presenter (staff); buzz groups by states preceding or following each topic.

Topics:
1. Uses of single vs. multiple measures
2. Plans for data collection (a la Campbell-Stanley)
3. Simple vs. complex data analyses
4. Problems in measuring changes*
5. Problems of reliability, validity, and bias
6. Relation of choice of measure to subject group and purposes of research
7. Problems of sampling and randomization

Presentation of Presage - Process - Product Model**
Examples of complex designs from which simple comparisons would have led to inappropriate conclusions. (Buzz first)

* Lord, F., Elementary Models for Measuring Change. in Harris, C.W. (Ed.) Problems in Measuring Change, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963, opening pp.

**Mitzel, H. E. (title like Teacher Effectiveness Research) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, McMillan, 1960 (?)

Monday Evening

Purpose: To develop awareness of whether an objective is stated in sufficiently behavioral fashion to be testable.*

Structure: Staff presenter followed by work groups across states.

Topics:
1. Group work to identify as wide a variety of educational goals as possible.
2. Presentation: Statement of educational goals in behavioral terms.**
3. Group work to convert as many goals as possible into behavioral terms, and identify those which cannot be made behavioral.

* Meger, (title like: Developing Behavioral Objectives), reference to be supplied.

** Example: Make "faster good citizenship" behavioral.

Tuesday Morning:

Purpose: To examine the uses of evaluation research data.

Structure: Presenter (staff) followed by cross-state work groups.

Presenter: Concept of feedback from research as a basis for evaluating program changes.

Work groups: Identify possible situations in which research feedback might help settle practical problems.

Break

Purpose: To present Force Field Analysis as a model for identifying forces supporting and restraining change.

Structure: Staff Presenter lecture and demonstration.

Topic: Force Field Analysis

Tuesday Afternoon:

Purpose: To identify forces which support or restrain the conduct of evaluation research and/or the use of feedback from it.

Structure: Work groups by state.

Topic: Force Field Analysis of home state.

Report to total group for cross fertilization.

Tuesday Evening:

Purpose: To clarify possible roles of the State Department in implementing the law.

Structure: A role play in state groups, followed by small group discussion and report back to total group.

Topic: Role play of state department representative, consulting with local school district representative, followed by small group discussion, reported to total group.

Questions: What possible roles is it appropriate for a state department to play in:

a. dissemination of research results
b. fastening use of feedback from evaluation research
c. increasing level of sophistication of research
d. helping local districts relate past research to their own research plans.

C. Wednesday Morning:

Purpose: To apply clinic learnings to evaluation of research proposals.

Structure: Triads: representative of local school district, representative of state department, and observer.
Roles Rotate.
Staff floats for consultation.

Topics: Presentation of research plan by school district representative, consultation by state department representative.
Analysis of: A research presentation
A consultation process.

Break

Purpose:* To identify possible changing rates of state department re: (a) local school districts; (b) Federal Government in relation to other aspects of state department function affected by the Education Bill.

Structure:* State work groups, floating staff, report to total group.

Purpose: To provide opportunities for discussion of problems of special interest.

Structure: Discussion groups led by staff or participants with special skill - based on survey of participants.

---

* Alternate Activities

Wednesday Afternoon:

Purpose: Identify points of influence on the time-line of application development and processing at which state department may effect change.

Structure: State work groups; floating staff; report to total group.

Topic: As indicated.

Purpose: Evaluate Clinic

Structure: State work groups; report to total group.

Topics: Implications of clinic for state department functions in relation to local districts.

What of clinic was relevant or useful; what was not?

C. Design III

Monday Morning:

Objective: To develop some perspectives on evaluation

Structure: Staff presentation -
(a) Levels of sophistication in research
(b) Identification of decisions left to the State

Participants in State groups discuss:
(a) Forces affecting level of activity
(b) State goals relative to evaluation

Recorders introduce group - Report back on 2a and b

Two staff members record forces and goals on newsprint.

Monday Afternoon: Continuation of morning program.

Four cross-state work groups, A, B, C, D, using "School Programs for the Disadvantaged."

(a) Select one proposal and as a team try to: delineate goals of an evaluation design for that proposal and identify and expand on means for carrying out the evaluation. (Each staff member will be a resource to a group.)

Monday Evening: Continuation of afternoon program.

Afternoon work groups report to whole group.
(a) Group A will particularly note presentation of Group B; Group B note C; Group C note D; Group D note A.

Buzz groups on critique of presentations of group noted.

Critique groups report back.

Staff having conferred during buzz groups will report on problems encountered in evaluative experiences of the groups.

Tuesday Morning:

Objective: To move from program purpose to measurement.

Structure: Four cross-state work groups select projects from same manual or from proposed projects from Congressional hearing report. Groups will try to identify concepts inherent in the selected project (e.g. citizenship, reading level, self-concept, occupational goals.)

Tuesday Afternoon:

Using proposals or abstracts of research design, the four cross-state work groups will review such proposals and offer a critique of
(a) concepts identified,
(b) the means used to measure the concepts,
(c) the usefulness of the projects.

What does it add to our knowledge?

Tuesday Evening:

Return to state groups.
(a) Purpose of the discussion is to identify criteria to be used in assessing research proposals.
(b) Staff will be available for resource help.

Wednesday Morning:

Objective: To develop a plan of action for our states.

Structure: State groups, using time-line sheet, develop a state plan.

Cross-state consultation in pairs to refine further lines of direction and to check out time-line plans.

Wednesday Afternoon:

Group together to discuss human values in an evaluation program. Buzz groups to facilitate presentation and discussion.

New issues in the Federal-State-Local front. Secular - secret. Public - private. Evaluation of import of this money on these relationships.

Particular emphasis was placed on the understanding of the Guidelines from the U.S. Office of Education which were in tentative draft at the time of the meetings. A representative of the Office of Education also attended a part of each meeting and assisted in clarifying the nature of the evaluation requirements of Title I of P.L. 89-10 and also clarified the nature of the educational research training program being developed by the Office of Education.

The intermediate week between the Eastern meetings and the Western meetings made it possible to review the designs and outcomes of the first five programs and make some modifications in the designs for the later meetings.

IV. WRITTEN PRODUCTS

A major effort was made to summarize the kinds of material which would be helpful for state department of education personnel, and this document, entitled "A guide to Evaluation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," authored by Lawrence E. Schlesinger, was delivered

to the Office of Education March 31, 1966. It was planned that this be edited and disseminated to all local school districts in the country. In addition, the design of each meeting served as a model which each participant could take back home in working with groups in his state.

V. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

At the end of each meeting a post-meeting reaction sheet was distributed, and the results are fairly consistent across all of the different programs. Each objective was listed and scored on a 5-point scale, with 1 meaning that the objective was ignored, overlooked, or met to a minimum degree, and 5 meaning that the objective was covered completely to their satisfaction. The mean scores across the nine programs are given below each of the objectives, as follows:

1. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.

   Mean score: 3.52

2. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.

   Mean score: 3.62

3. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.

   Mean score: 3.37

4. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.

   Mean score: 3.90

5. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.

   Mean score: 2.91

6. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.

   Mean score: 3.21

7. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.

   Mean score: 3.36

In addition to these reactions, three areas were identified by both staff and participants as problems that were faced at the meetings:

1. <u>Participants' expectations</u>.

   The staff indicated that most participants were uncertain as to the purposes of the meetings. A number of them felt Title IV of P.L. 89-10 was the proposed subject; others thought it was to be a workshop on how to write proposals; and many said they would have liked some preliminary

material beforehand. A number of the participants in the Eastern meetings had just returned from the administrative conference in Atlanta and thought the evaluation meetings would be a continuation of the same. Several of the staff felt this belief was responsible for an initial low level of interest.

2. Importance of evaluation research.

Several participants felt the evaluation requirements of proposals would serve as a barrier to distributing needed funds, and expressed a greater interest in learning the do's and don't's of writing evaluation sections of proposals rather than exploring the rationale and techniques of evaluation research.

3. Resistance to programs.

A number of staff teams discerned some degree of resistance to their initial efforts on evaluation research. They discovered many participants had some important feelings which had to be dealt with before evaluation designs could be realistically considered. A number of state department personnel felt they could be in the position of serving a holding action as they realized that local proposals would not meet the evaluation requirements but that local public opinion would be adamant in its demand for X number of dollars as computed from the formula in the 3111. This led some to feel they might have to approve every proposal which came to their attention. Others felt the consideration of state guidelines on evaluation would be premature as they expected a detailed pre-emptive statement from Washington.

VI. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This training program indicated the feasibility of mounting short-term meetings in a short space of time, including the interest and participation of professionals in the field of educational research. The evaluation data indicate that some progress was made towards reaching the objectives of the program despite a great deal of unclarity about the evaluation requirements, the role of state department of education personnel in administering the provisions of P.L. 89-10, and the tentative nature of the guidelines available from the U.S. Office of Education. It remains quite clear, however, that this population of people are in need of a much more substantial program in research design before achieving any sophistication in evaluation research. In the main, their concerns were more administrative then substantive, and the decision to prepare a major document was an attempt to provide some further resources which could be referred to for guidance in evaluation research where there were only minimal skills in actual conduct of research.

VII. ACCOUNTING OF THE PROJECT TO DATE

Category	Total Expended
1. Personnel	
A. National Training Laboratories Central Office Staff	
Dr. Charles Seashore, Project Director	$ 3,275.69
Dr. Cyril R. Mill, Assistant Project Director	1,672.96
Mr. Robert A. Luke, Staff Assistant	754.87
Miss Carol Jacoby, Project Secretary	1,376.82
B. Consultant Staff	
Staff for Regional Meetings	16,000.00
Additional Consultation, Robert Chin	100.00
Writing of Resource Book, Dr. Lawrence Schlesinger	4,600.00
2. Supplies and Material	
A. Office and Regional Meetings Supplies	911.00
B. Communications	966.68
C. Miscellaneous	781.89
3. Services	
A. Duplicating	446.78
B. Postage and Express	337.66
4. Travel	
A. National Training Laboratories Central Office Staff	443.82
B. Staff for Regional Meetings	2,595.12
C. Participants at Meetings	15,944.62
D. Consultant - Dr. Lawrence Schlesinger	23.40
5. Per Diem	
A. National Training Laboratories Central Office Staff	9.75
B. Staff for Regional Meetings	2,634.85
C. Participants at Meetings	14,771.63
TOTAL - Direct Costs	$ 67,647.64
6. Overhead - 8% of Direct Costs	5,411.80
GRAND TOTAL	$ 73,059.34

Amount of Grant Funds Received: $ 73,059.34

Note: The above amounts were billed to the U.S. Office of Education in detail by monthly statements.

APPENDIX A

Roster of Participants and Staff
(listed by State)
Eastern Regions
October 17-20, 1965

Region I - Boston, Massachusetts	Amount of Support
Connecticut	
Wallace Roby	$ 64.80
Maine	
Philip A. Ammas	48.00
Joseph J. Devitt	94.60
Stanley L. Freeman, Jr.	98.40
Philip C. Libby	99.15
Ronald Logan	84.00
William T. Logan	-0-
Carroll R. McGary	64.60
Massachusetts	
Richard P. Charlton	32.00
Joseph E. Killory	56.00
Frederick A. Small	40.00
Everett G. Thistle	40.60
John Torosian	66.80
New Hampshire	
Paul R. Fillion	54.00
Lewis F. Foote	65.30
Rhode Island	
Edward J. Condon	56.00
Edward T. Costa	67.50
Arthur T. Geoghegan	48.80
Charles P. Hollstein	52.10
Vermont	
Richard A. Dowd	96.00
Walter D. Gallagher	108.00
Raymond B. Magwire	90.20
Karlene V. Russell	71.90
Sub-total	$1426.85

Region I, continued	Staff
Dr. Robert Chin (Chairman) Human Relations Center Boston University	
Dr. James M. Burke Educational Consultant Connecticut Department of Education	
Dr. John D. Herzog Harvard Graduate School of Education	
Dr. Donald C. Klein Human Relations Center Boston University	

Region II -New York, New York	Amount of Support
Delaware	
W. Franklin Barr	$ 60.20
D. Russell Friend	68.15
Ruth M. Laws	69.70
Elizabeth C. Lloyd	66.55
Marian B. Miller	67.00
W. A. Proctor	70.98
Howard E. Row	81.32
Robert B. Rowen	-0-
Dustin W. Wilson, Jr.	66.82
New Jersey	
Minerva F. Desing	64.00
Louis A. Dughi	32.40
W. Frank Johnson	64.40
Sam Matarazzo	34.40
Ellmore H. Slaybaugh	65.35

Region II, New Jersey, continued

	Amount of Support
Harold K. Smith	$ 55.00
Carl W. Swanson	65.48
David Tankel	47.98
Anne R. Tantum	37.48
New York	
Sigmund Abeles	55.50
James Cabeceiras	106.30
Louis T. DiZorenzo	48.00
Eileen M. Kelly	87.80
Lon Kleinman	-0-
Leslie D. McLean	-0-
Egon Mermelstein	59.50
Irving Rothchild	55.53
Gerald H. Wohlferd	45.50
Pennsylvania	
Edwin B. Carskadon	110.70
Henry J. Gatski	103.69
John E. Koscloski	106.18
Mervin E. Manning	90.48
Guy Minadeo	124.45
Walbert Murphy	90.35
Sub-total	$1957.86

Staff

Dr. Edmund J. Amidon (Chairman)
Group Dynamics Center
Temple University

Dr. Wesley Dorn
Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education

Dr. Robert Hayes
Bureau of Research
Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Donald Medley
Educational Testing Service

Region III, Charlottesville, Virginia

	Amount of Support
	$
Kentucky	
Eugene Camic	140.34
Eddie W. Belcher	136.45
James C. Farmer	135.40
Burtis Franklin	120.30
W. R. McNeill	-0-
Newman Walker	167.90
Maryland	
J. Edward Andrews, Jr.	56.00
Mae Graham	40.00
James W. Jacobs	96.00
Richard W. McKay	40.00
Thomas W. Pyles	56.00
North Carolina	
Joseph L. Cashwell	100.80
Thelma L. Cumbo	56.00
Myrtle M. Haigwood	56.00
Woodrow B. Sugg	100.80
Bert W. Westbrook	56.00
Puerto Rico	
Charles O. Hamill	206.50
Eduardo J. Rivera-Medina	198.00
Virgin Islands	
Huldah A. Joseph	241.60
Virginia	
Oren R. Counts	81.00
Frank H. Elliott	56.00
Clarence L. Kent	56.00
William C. Overton	84.50
Robert W. Parlier	-0-
George G. Tankard, Jr.	51.10
Alton L. Taylor	71.00
James W. Tyler	71.00
West Virginia	
Lawrence G. Derthick, Jr.	103.85
Daniel B. Taylor	119.10
Sub-total	$2562.24

Region III, continued

Staff

Dr. Stuart Gilbreath (Chairman)
Testing & Counseling Center
University of Cincinnati

Dr. Robert P. Beynon
Division of Research
Ohio Department of Education

Dr. Egon Guba
Bureau of Educational Research and Service
Ohio State University

Dr. Lawrence E. Schlesinger
George Washington University

Region IV-Atlanta, Georgia

	Amount of Support
Alabama	
J. Clyde Blair	$ 87.00
J. H. Boockholdt	91.00
Erline Curlee	92.00
W. Morrisen McCalls	89.70
Clifton Nash	93.00
Annie M. Turner	96.40
Arizona	
Elizabeth Taspcott	256.80
Florida	
C. N. Fagan, Jr.	112.14
Rodney P. Smith, Jr.	101.00
I. M. Wade	95.69
Georgia	
Jeff L. Cain	69.80
R. C. Beemon	4.00
Harry L. Bowman	-0-
C. H. Huff	54.40
Sam S. Jossey	101.00
John E. Robinson	110.28
Daughtry L. Thomas	56.00

Region IV, continued

	Amount of Support
Kentucky	
D. C. Anderson	$ 113.89
Stella A. Edwards	117.44
Claude A. Taylor	113.90
Fred. D. Williams	129.42
Mississippi	
Ralph Brewer	121.70
W. L. Hearn	90.10
Ruby M. Thompson	122.20
A. G. Shepherd, Jr.	121.20
South Carolina	
Sidney B. Cooper	92.20
Harris A. Marshall	90.43
Donald C. Pearce	91.70
William B. Royster	88.23
Tennessee	
John R. Cox	-0-
E. B. Eller	-0-
Vernon L. Johnson	100.00
John R. Lovegrove	-0-
Willis C. Nowell	98.60
Sub-total	$3001.22

Staff

Dr. Robert S. Soar (Chairman)
Group Dynamics Center
Temple University

Dr. Homer C. Cooper
Social Science Research Center
University of Georgia

Dr. Robert Newton
Pre-School Child Study Research Project

Dr. Paul Penningroth
Southern Regional Education Board

Region V, Chicago, Illinois

	Amount of Support
Illinois	
Frank Christensen	$ 62.00
Thomas J. Denny	97.00
Ralph E. Lundgren	43.00
Charles J. Miller	43.20
Earl J. Schuur	52.42
Denson Sprouse	79.70
Donald Thomas	35.20
George Topping	48.00
Indiana	
Earl L. Grove	87.93
Charles D. Hopkins	97.93
K. Forbis Jordan	83.40
Aaron T. Lindley	56.00
James H. McElhinney	98.00
Don C. Patton	93.80
Edgar B. Smith	96.98
Michigan	
Donald R. Beaton	96.20
Allen L. Bernstein	79.95
Louis Kocsis	96.20
Paul N. Lehto	96.90
Leon S. Waskin	94.90
Minnesota	
John E. Bicknell	114.70
Farley D. Bright	114.20
Sigurd J. Ode	114.70
Nebraska	
C. Edward Cavert	140.10
Gustave R. Lieske	137.80
Glen E. Shafer	136.00
Leonard Skov	137.80
James E. Sorensen	136.80
Ohio	
Clifford B. Elliott	104.70
Jonn A. Marrah	104.70
Russell A. Working	106.23
South Dakota	
Olive S. Berg	$ 166.80
L. P. Duenwald	154.80
Norris M. Paulson	179.35
E. W. Skarda	145.25
Wisconsin	
William H. Ashbaugh	74.00
Archie A. Buchmiller	58.90
John J. Cook	91.00
Dale O. Irwin	76.00
Richard R. Roth	93.10
Sub-total	$3925.64

Staff

Dr. Mildred Peters (Chairman)
Educational Guidance & Counseling
Wayne State University

Dr. John Hough
College of Education
Ohio State University

Dr. Fred Lighthall
Department of Education
University of Chicago

Dr. Bertram B. Masia
Department of Education
University of Chicago

Western Regions
October 24-27, 1965

Region VI, Kansas City, Missouri

	Amount of Support
Luncheons for staff and participants, paid for by National Training Laboratories, and deducted from their per diem.	$ 193.19
Iowa	
William M. Baley	86.15
James E. Bowman	85.46
Richard D. Brooks	83.95
Ralph Van Dusseldorp	103.45
Giles J. Smith	86.05
Kansas	
G. L. Cleland	56.55
T. William Goodwin	63.95
James E. Marshall	65.45
Henry A. Parker	64.45
Charles B. Watkins	70.75
Lyle Welch	48.95
Kentucky	
Sidney Simandle	124.65
Minnesota	
Reynold Erickson	104.55
G. Dean Miller	115.05
Gordon Miniclier	101.05
Missouri	
Charles E. Blackman	68.25
Edmund L. Downey	56.45
David Latimer	91.47
John T. Lawrence	68.15
Lewis W. Ogle	59.09
Donald R. Shire	65.95
North Dakota	
Glenn R. Dolan	164.45
Kiaran L. Dooley	173.05

Region VI, continued

	Amount of Support
Rhode Island	
Steward R. Essex	$ 204.45
Sub-total	$2404.96

Staff

Dr. J. Weldon Moffitt (Chairman)
Brigham Young University

Dr. Clyde Baer
Division of Research & Development
School District of Kansas City

Dr. Robert P. Beynon
Division of Research
Ohio Department of Education

Dr. Max R. Goodson
Research & Development Center
University of Wisconsin

Region VII, Dallas, Texas

Arkansas	
Andy F. Aldridge	107.60
Ray E. Bruce	122.88
Hugh Lovett	108.60
LeRoy Pennington	108.60
Ralph B. Riley	105.00
Leon L. Wilson	109.60
Canal Zone	
Ellis L. Fawcett	344.60
William C. Garber	344.60
Carl F. Maedl	344.60
David A. Speir, Jr.	344.60
Clyde A. Willman	344.60

Region VII, continued

	Amount of Support
Louisiana	
Joe W. Campbell	$ 120.36
George Feyerabend	136.41
John E. Fitzpatrick	115.60
Charles R. Jarreau	154.75
Murray I. Jones	124.36
Donald L. Kennedy	79.40
Louis B. Roth, Jr.	133.15
Robert E. Wall	144.68
New Mexico	
F. E. Atkinson	139.80
Henry B. Hammer	133.65
Robert J. Myers	133.40
Robert A. Swanson	129.90
Calloway Taulbee	133.15
Oklahoma	
Merle Collins	100.00
John C. Egermeier	118.20
Gerald D. Kidd	56.00
Paul I. McCloud	105.00
Tommy Sullivan	106.50
James H. Petree	56.00
J. F. Thompson	100.00
Maurice P. Walraven	100.00
Texas	
Julian Biggers	56.00
D. Frank Clark	98.20
H. Bennett Cooksey	82.00
John R. Guemple	56.00
James F. Jeffrey	96.00
William T. Kinniell	96.00
Guy B. McNiel	98.20
Charles W. Nix	56.00
H. E. Phillips	58.65
Tom W. Porter	63.20
Richard D. Slater	104.20
Billy L. Turney	64.60

Region VII, continued

	Amount of Support
Washington, D.C.	
Mildred P. Cooper	$ 230.50
Joseph M. Carroll	236.55
Elizabeth V. Lindsay	228.50
Harry B. Rutherford	228.50
Sub-total	$6602.69

Staff

Dr. Marie Hughes
College of Education
University of Arizona

Dr. Elbert D. Brooks
Tucson Public Schools

Dr. Frances Hine
Office of Los Angeles County
Supervisor of Schools

Dr. Kenneth MacIntyre
Department of Education
University of Texas

Region VIII, Denver, Colorado

Colorado	
Kenneth B. Ashcraft	-0-
Paul G. Bethke	-0-
Edward A. Brainard	11.79
Lewis R. Crum	-0-
Richard M. Fawley	24.00
John L. Hayman, Jr.	24.00
Herbert H. Hughes	26.00
Gerald F. Ulrich	21.00
Arthur R. Olson	73.00
Ward M. Vining	18.00
Russell B. Vlaanderer	-0-

Region VIII, continued

	Amount of Support
Idaho	
D. H. Beary	$ 155.00
Harold T. Farley	154.50
Maynard G. Lewis	153.50
Camden B. Meyer	158.15
Robert E. Neal	153.50
Andrew L. Smith	197.00
Kansas	
Ralph A. Forsythe	16.75
Montana	
George R. Bandy	169.70
Shelby O. Bewley	194.24
Wayne Grames	164.30
Marie Mastorovich	164.30
Paul T. O'Hara	128.66
Robert C. Roberts	167.60
Utah	
Maurice C. Barnett	116.05
Harry P. Bluhm	115.80
Walter R. Borg	129.20
James W. Dunn	127.80
Rulon R. Garfield	122.80
Le Mora L. Losee	120.50
Elwin Nielsen	113.30
Quentin E. Utley	116.30
Ray D. Warner	129.20
Wyoming	
Harold R. Goff	81.65
Paul G. Graves	74.00
Blaine Ronne	100.00
Ruth Schmitt	97.50
Albert B. Schultz	107.40
Dean P. Talagan	60.40
Sidney C. Werner	81.65
Sub-total	$3564.54

Staff

Dr. Norman N. Paris (Chairman)
Testing & Counseling Center
University of Cincinnati

Region VIII, continued

Dr. Phillip Daniels
Brigham Young University

Dr. Nicholas P. Georgiady
Michigan Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Kenneth Hopkins
School of Education
University of Colorado

Region IX - San Francisco, California

	Amount of Support
Alaska	
Nathaniel H. Cole	$ 292.90
Jeff C. Jeffers	295.40
Winifred D. Lande	276.70
William R. Marsh	276.70
Robert L. Thomas	292.50
Arizona	
W. Maurice Gemmell	144.45
Ralph Goitia	133.60
Herschel Hooper	145.95
Charles R. McDowell	133.60
Fred L. Schmitt	155.35
California	
Ray L. Sweigert, Jr.	83.75
Hawaii	
Ronald L. Johnson	266.20
Clarence N. Masumotoya	267.30
Idaho	
Ross E. Barney	131.50
Nevada	
John R. Gamble	82.95
Robert L. Lloyd, Jr.	82.95
Donald K. Perry	82.95
Gerald R. Shelby	84.35
Byron F. Stetler	88.25

Region IX, continued

	Amount of Support
Oregon	$
Milt R. Baum	131.00
Willard Bear	131.00
Maynard L. Christensen	131.00
James B. Ellingson	123.00
Austin E. Haddock	146.40
Luis E. Morales	136.60
Washington	
Marjorie Mottishaw Anderson	142.90
James W. Hardie	112.67
Ernest G. Kramer	153.20
Alan W. Metcalf	142.90
Harold G. Smith	142.90
Sub-total	$ 4655.37

Staff

Dr. Peter Lenrow (Chairman)
University of California

Dr. Jay E. Jongeward
Washington Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Mary D. Martin
Office of Los Angeles County Supervisor of Schools

Dr. Arthur P. Coladarci
Stanford University

TOTAL AMOUNT OF SUPPORT

$30,101.37

APPENDIX B

A GUIDE TO EVALUATION OF TITLE I of the ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT of 1965

by
LAWRENCE E. SCHLESINGER, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation: Responsibilities and Questions

Perspective

What is Evaluation? -- An Overview

Why Describe Objectives Clearly?

How to Clarify Objectives

Criterion Tests

Measuring Student Change

Achievement Tests

Guidelines for Testing Disadvantaged Children
- List of Standardized Tests
- Publishers of Tests
- Glossary of Terms

Developing a Testing Program

Measuring Steps Along the Path

Developing an Evaluation Plan

Preparation of Summary Evaluation Report

APPENDIX
- References
- Bibliography